

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

4 POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation,

5 Plaintiff/Counter-
6 Defendant,

7 v.

Case No. 09-cv-05235-MMC

8 FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
9 INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware
corporation, FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
10 CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, and
SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION, a
Taiwanese corporation,

11 Defendants/Counter-
12 Plaintiffs.

VERDICT FORM

VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

I. INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '908 PATENT**A. Direct Infringement**

1. Has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Fairchild products literally infringe the following claims of the '908 patent? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Literal Infringement By Fairchild				
Patent No. 6,538,908				
	SG6841 Type Products		FAN6747 Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 26		✓		✓
Claim 27		✓		✓

2. If you answered "NO" for any claim(s) and product(s) in Question 1, has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Fairchild product(s) nevertheless infringe any of those claim(s) of the '908 patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) **If you answered "YES" for any claim(s) and product(s) in Question 1, you may skip this question as to those claim(s) and product(s).**

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Doctrine of Equivalents Infringement By Fairchild				
Patent No. 6,538,908				
	SG6841 Type Products		FAN6747 Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B. Indirect Infringement

3. Has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild induced others to infringe the '908 patent? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

YES

NO

[☒]

[☐]

II. WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF THE '908 PATENT

4. If you answered "YES" as to any claim(s) for any of questions 1-3, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

YES

NO

[☒]

[☐]

III. INVALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '908 PATENT

5. Has Fairchild proven by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the '908 patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	YES	NO
Claim 26	[]	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Claim 27	[]	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

IV. INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '079 PATENT

A. Direct Infringement

6. Has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Fairchild products literally infringe the following claims of the '079 patent in a power supply? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Literal Infringement By Fairchild										
Patent No. 6,212,079										
Power supply with:	SG6841 Type Products		SG5841 Type Products		SG5841J Type Products		FAN103 Type Products		SG3842G Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Claim 34	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Claim 38	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Claim 42	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

7. If you answered "NO" for any claim(s) and product(s) in Question 6, has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Fairchild products nevertheless infringe any of those claim(s) of the '079 patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents in a power supply? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) **If you answered "YES" for any claim(s) and product(s) in Question 6, you may skip this question as to those claim(s) and product(s).**

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Doctrine of Equivalents Infringement By Fairchild										
Patent No. 6,212,079										
Power supply with:	SG6841 Type Products		SG5841 Type Products		SG5841J Type Products		FAN103 Type Products		SG3842G Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 31										
Claim 34										
Claim 38										
Claim 42										

B. Indirect Infringement

8. Has Power Integrations proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild induced others to infringe the '079 patent? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

YES

NO

[☒]

[☐]

V. WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF THE '079 PATENT

9. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for any of questions 6-8, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

YES

NO

[☒]

[☐]

VI. INVALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '079 PATENT

10. Has Fairchild proven by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the '079 patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

YES

NO

Claim 31 [☐]

[☒]

Claim 34 [☐]

[☒]

Claim 38 [☐]

[☒]

Claim 42 [☐]

[☒]

VII. POWER INTEGRATIONS' PATENTS – DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)

11. If you have found that Fairchild has infringed at least one valid claim from either of the '908 or '079 patents, what is the dollar amount Power Integrations has proved it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for past infringement:

You should fill in only one box below depending upon which Power Integrations patent(s) you have found both valid and infringed. If you have not found any Power Integrations patent(s) both valid and infringed, you may skip this question.

Damages if BOTH the '908 and '079 patents are valid and infringed:	\$ 105,000,000
Damages if ONLY the '908 patent is valid and infringed :	\$
Damages if ONLY the '079 patent is valid and infringed:	\$

VIII. INFRINGEMENT OF FAIRCHILD'S '977 PATENT

A. Direct Infringement

12. Has Fairchild proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Power Integrations products literally infringe claim 6 of the '977 patent when used in a power supply? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Literal Infringement By Power Integrations										
Patent No. 5,747,977										
Power supply with:	DPA423GN Type Products		TOP232PN Type Products		TOP264VG Type Products		TNY376 Type Products		LNK623PG Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 6		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

13. If you answered "NO" for any products(s) in Question 12, has Fairchild proven by a preponderance of the evidence that that the accused Power Integrations products nevertheless infringe claim 6 of the '977 patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents when used in a power supply? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.) **If you answered "YES" for any product(s) in Question 12, you may skip this question as to those product(s).**

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

Doctrine of Equivalents Infringement By Power Integrations										
Patent No. 5,747,977										
Power supply with:	DPA423GN Type Products		TOP232PN Type Products		TOP264VG Type Products		TNY376 Type Products		LNK623PG Type Products	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 6		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

B. Indirect Infringement

14. Has Fairchild proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Power Integrations induced others to infringe the '977 patent? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

YES**NO**

[]

[☒]**IX. FAIRCHILD'S '977 PATENT – DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)**

15. If you have found that Power Integrations has infringed claim 6 of the '977 patent, what is the total dollar amount Fairchild has proved it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for past infringement:

If you have not found infringement of the '977 patent, you may skip this question.

Damages if '977 patent is infringed:	\$
--------------------------------------	----

Your foreperson must sign and date this Verdict Form:

Dated: 3/4/14Signed: Colleen (foreperson)Andrew DeGroot